

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

Date: January 28, 2004

By: 

Sandy Reisman

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: KIRK BEACH *ET AL.*

APPLICATION No.: 09/662,414

FILED: SEPTEMBER 14, 2000

FOR: **SYSTEM FOR VOUCHER OR
TOKEN VERIFICATION**

EXAMINER: KAMBIZ ABDI

ART UNIT: 3621

CONF. No: 9962

Response to Interview Summary

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

FEB - 5 2004

GROUP 3600

Sir:

The present communication responds to the Interview Summary mailed from the Patent Office on January 13, 2004 regarding a telephone interview held on January 7, 2004 between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner in the above-identified application. The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for preparing the Interview Summary. However, the undersigned attorney wishes to clarify a couple of misstatements in the Interview Summary.

The Interview Summary states that the undersigned attorney agreed with the Examiner that claim 1, as well as other independent claims with similar limitations, has "certain ambiguity." Although the undersigned attorney agreed that it might be possible to improve certain portions of the claim language, at no time during the interview did he ever agree that claim 1, or any other claim for that matter, was ambiguous. To the contrary, throughout the interview, the undersigned attorney steadfastly maintained that all of the claims in the present application met or exceeded the threshold requirements

of clarity and precision set forth by 35 U.S.C. §112 and reflected in §2173.02 of the MPEP.

The Interview Summary further states that the undersigned attorney agreed with the Examiner's position on the proper usage of the applied reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,116,402), and "pointed out that the applicant would like to file a petition to change the priority of the current application..." To the contrary, at no time did the undersigned attorney indicate that applicant would file a petition to change the priority of the present application. The undersigned attorney did, however, raise the possibility that the applicant might choose to amend the present application to include a priority claim to U.S. Patent No. 6,116,402 as a Continuation-In-Part application.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes another telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6351.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Stephen E. Arnett

Registration No. 47,392

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000